

Return to: randy.mcintyre@nebraska.gov OR
Randy McIntyre, School Improvement Coordinator
Nebraska Department of Education
301 Centennial Mall South
Lincoln, NE 68509

NDE 04-059
Due: February 24, 2014

ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants (SIG) LEA (District) Application

District Name: Madison Public Schools
County-District Number: 59-0001

Introduction

School Improvement Grants, authorized under Section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants, through State educational agencies (SEA = Nebraska Department of Education or NDE), to local educational agencies (LEA = districts) for use in eligible schools that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of their students. Under the final requirements, as amended through the interim final requirements published in the Federal Register in January 2010, these school improvement funds are to be used to implement identified Intervention Models in the persistently lowest-achieving schools identified as:

Tier I Schools means the five (5) or 5% (whichever is greatest) of all lowest-achieving Title I schools identified to be in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring plus any Title I served secondary school with a graduation rate of less than 75% over the three latest years that was not captured in the above five schools.

- For every year after the initial year, previously identified Tier III schools that have a Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant will be included and Tier I schools with school improvement waivers that are implementing the Turnaround model will be excluded.

Tier II Schools shall mean the five (5) or 5% (whichever is greatest) lowest ranked secondary schools where the "all students" group meets the minimum n-size for AYP that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds plus any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that has a graduation rate of less than 75% over the three latest years and was not captured in the above schools.

- For every year after the initial year, previously identified Tier II schools that have a Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant will be excluded and Tier III schools that fall within the bottom five (5) or 5% (whichever is greater of the pool of schools for Tier II will be included.

Tier III Schools means any Title I school identified to be in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is not a Tier I School and any school that is ranked as low as the Tier I and Tier II schools but has no groups of at least 30 students.

The procedure used to identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools, including the definitions used, is found in Appendix A of this application.

A District that applies for a School Improvement Grant must serve each of its Tier I schools using one of the four school intervention models unless the District demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to do so. If a district has a Tier I and Tier II school(s), it may elect to serve schools in both Tiers, but if it elects to serve only the Tier II school(s) and not the Tier I school(s), it must explain how it lacks the capacity to serve the Tier I school(s). If a district has Tier I and Tier III schools, it may not elect to serve only Tier III schools. Districts may submit applications that contain Tier III schools but all Tier I and Tier II schools in the state must be served, or demonstrate that districts lack the capacity to serve them, prior to any Tier III school being approved for funds.

Nebraska has applied for a waiver from section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA. This waiver allows Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to "start over" in the school improvement timeline. Nebraska has also applied for a waiver of the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit Title I schools to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold.

Nebraska has applied for a waiver of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2013 school improvement funds for the DEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2017.

Nebraska has applied to waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in § 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold and is fully implementing one of the four intervention models.

To ensure commitment and support, the Cover Page of the district application must be signed by the President of the School Board and the Superintendent or Authorized Representative.

The guidance from the U. S. Department of Education for ESEA Section 1003(g) grants provides the information needed for understanding the requirements, the four intervention models and should be studied prior to completing this application. The guidance is on NDE's Title IA School Improvement page at: http://www.education.ne.gov/federalprograms/Title_1_Part_A_SIG.html

All district applications that are approved will be posted at the above url within 30 days of being approved. Additional information on the ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants is also available on the U. S. Department of Education website at: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/index.html>.

Use of Funds

In the Tier I and Tier II schools a district chooses to serve, the district must use these funds to implement one of these four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model. Section 2 of this application contains the description of the four intervention models taken from the U. S. Department of Education guidance. This description identifies all the requirements to be implemented and some permissible activities for each of the four models. These are the only activities that can be funded with the ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants in Tier I and Tier II schools. Tier III schools that are Title I schools currently identified to be in school improvement, corrective action or restructuring can apply to use ESEA Section 1003(g) funds to implement one of these models or for other school improvement activities designed to support, expand, continue or complete school improvement activities included in its SIG application. Tier III schools that

are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds can apply for these funds to implement a variation of the Transformation intervention model. This variation of the Transformation model allows, but does not require, a school to replace the principal or the staff (Sections A and C of part (1)(i) of the model as defined in this application. This is also indicated on the Action Plans.)

Districts must demonstrate capacity to implement the selected intervention model in the first year and fully implement the model within the three years of funding of these grants. In addition to the requirements of each intervention model, Nebraska is requiring each school receiving ESEA Section 1003(g) funds to have a full-or part-time Intervention Project Manager (IPM). The intervention models are designed to turnaround a school and the requirements are numerous and specific. A school making a commitment to take on the major changes involved must have a person devoted solely to managing and coordinating the process. The Intervention Project Manager must be experienced and qualified to lead the effort and must be an employee of the district or on contract to the district. The IPM will have, at a minimum, a current Nebraska teaching certificate. The responsibilities of this person include: working with the school principal and district administrators to assist with coordinating implementation activities, conducting ongoing evaluations of progress, ensuring appropriate collection and management of data for reporting progress on the goals established for student achievement and leading indicators, and coordinating and reporting progress to the NDE. The costs of the Intervention Project Manager are to be included on the budgets for each school.

Available Funds

For the three year grants that begin in 2014-15, approximately \$2,417,000 are available from ESEA for these Section 1003(g) funds. Depending on future appropriations from Congress, the State should continue to receive similar ESEA amounts in future years. ESEA funds available now must follow the requirements of this application which includes a waiver for use over three years –2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17.

A district may apply for the amount of funds needed to fully and effectively implement one of the four intervention models in a Tier I or Tier II school not to exceed two (2) million dollars a year for three years per school. There is a minimum of \$50,000 per year per school. This minimum amount is not required if a district can demonstrate that it can fully implement one of the intervention models with less funds. Applications must contain a budget for each of the three years identifying the costs of implementing an intervention model in each school. When budgeting for the three-year period, NDE would expect to see the budgets decrease each year. Keep this in mind when planning for sustainability after the grant period comes to an end. The NDE will award grants based on the proposals by school(s) within a district. This means a district could apply for funds for more than one school but may not be funded for all the schools included in the application. The amount requested may also be reduced based on funds available. Districts with Tier III schools can apply for the same or a lesser amount of funds per school. However, the State cannot award a grant to a district for a Tier III school unless and until all Tier I and Tier II schools in the State, that are eligible and have the capacity, receive funds.

Continued Funding

While the application will be approved for the full three years, it must be reviewed and approved for continued funding each year. There are three considerations for approval for continued funding in years two and three that will be applied on a school level basis: (1) demonstrating progress in student achievement and leading indicators, (2) being on target, or close to, meeting the timelines identified in

the Action Plans, and (3) spending the approved funds in a timely fashion. Each year's budget must reflect the amount of funds needed in that year. When budgeting for the three-year period, NDE would expect to see the budgets decrease each year. Keep this in mind when planning for sustainability after the grant period comes to an end. Budget forms are found in a separate EXCEL file at: http://www.education.ne.gov/federalprograms/Title_1_Part_A_SIG.html

Supplement, Not Supplant

ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Funds are supplemental funds (see pages 43-44 of March 1, 2012 USDE *Guidance on Fiscal Year 201 School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*) and as such must be in addition to the regular state and local funding provided to the school. Schools that are not currently Title I schoolwide projects must become a schoolwide project in order to implement one of the intervention models. A waiver that allows this is included in the application. The waiver also allows the planning for this application to replace the required year of planning for a schoolwide project.

Application Writing Assistance

NDE will provide meetings and/or conference calls to support the districts intending to apply. Districts are encouraged to review the "Reviewers Rating and Checklist" designed for application reviewers to ensure that all components are addressed. The Reviewers Rating and Checklist is found in Appendix B of this application.

Application Approval Process

Nebraska will convene a panel of NDE staff with experience and expertise in Title I and school improvement activities to review all applications. The scoring checklist is included as Appendix B to the District application. Each school's application will be reviewed and rated individually. Districts may submit an application that includes an application for more than one school and may include schools from any Tier. To ensure that the schools with the highest need are selected, the following process will be used to determine the applications to recommend to the State Board of Education for approval.

After the panel has reviewed and rated all applications, the score from Section 1 District information will be added to the score received by the school for Section 2 School Information for a "total score". For applications containing multiple schools, the district's score will be added to the score of each school for a "total score" for each school. The schools will be rank-ordered by the total scores. The highest ranking schools will determine the finalists, considering the amount of funds requested and the amount of funds available. NDE reserves the right to adjust budget requests, if needed, to increase the number of finalists or to ensure more equitable distribution of grants relative to size of school or geographic location.

Schools that are finalists must participate in a team interview conference call with NDE staff. This interview is an opportunity for NDE staff to validate application responses and evaluate school staff commitment and capacity before making the recommendations for final approval.

Applications Timelines

Applications are due by midnight (Central Daylight Time) on February 13, 2014 and should be submitted electronically to: randy.mcintyre@nebraska.gov. In addition, the District must submit a cover page signed by the District's authorized representative and the president of the school board. This document can either be scanned and submitted via email to the above email address or a hard copy can be mailed to:

Randy McIntyre, School Improvement Coordinator
Nebraska Department of Education
301 Centennial Mall South
PO BOX 94987
Lincoln, NE 68509

Application Contents

The ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant application consists of

- Introduction
- Application Cover Page
- Section 1 – District Information
- Section 2 – School Level Information

Appendices are Included as Separate Documents

- Appendix A – PLAS Identification Process with Diagrams
- Appendix B –Reviewers Rating and Checklist
- Appendix C –Budget Forms. The link to all Budget Forms is found at:
http://www.education.ne.gov/federalprograms/Title_1_Part_A_SIG.html



NOTE: When budgeting for the three-year period, NDE would expect to see the budgets decrease each year. Keep this in mind when planning for sustainability after the grant period comes to an end.

A completed application includes the following and should be submitted electronically to randy.mcintyre@nebraska.gov:

- Application Cover Page signed by the president of the school board and the authorized representative of the district.
- Section 1. District Information
- Section 2. School Level Information (Completed Section 2 for each school included in the application)
- Budget pages (EXCEL spreadsheet) for each school for each year of the grant

ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

APPLICATION COVER PAGE

District Name: Madison Public Schools	District Mailing Address: Box 450 Madison, NE 68748
County/District Number: 59-0001	
District Contact for the School Improvement Grant	
Name: Alan Ehlers	
Position and Office: Superintendent	
Contact's Mailing Address: Box 450, Madison, NE 68748	
Telephone: 402-454-3336	
Fax: 402-454-2238	
Email address: aehlers@esu8.org	
President of the School Board (Printed Name): Harlow Hanson	Telephone: 402-454-3336
Signature of the President of the School Board X 	Date:
Authorized Representative of the District (Printed Name): Alan Ehlers	Telephone: 402-454-3336 Email: aehlers@esu8.org
Signature of the Authorized Representative: X 	Date: 2-18-14
The district, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the district receives through this application.	

SECTION 1. DISTRICT INFORMATION

PART A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED

- A.1 Complete the information in the table for each school in the district included in this application. Identify whether each school is in Tier I, II or III. **When Section 2 of this application is completed, indicate the intervention model to be implemented for each Tier I and Tier II school. Add rows as needed.**

School Name	NCES ID#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Intervention Model (Tier I and Tier II Only)			
					Turnaround	Restart	Closure	Transformation
Madison High School				X				X

- A.2 If the district has determined that a Tier I or Tier II school has implemented, in whole or in part, one of the intervention models within the last two years, the district must list that school here. Districts must also complete the Action Plans and Budgets required in Part B of this application to provide evidence to demonstrate that this school has met, or is in the process of meeting, each of the requirements of that model and will have the model fully implemented within the period of availability of these funds.

PART B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION DISTRICT LEVEL

Analysis of Need and Capacity

ESEA Section 1003(g) requires an analysis of need at the district level and a determination of district's capacity to provide support to use these funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II School in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected. Districts are encouraged to look at existing sources of information while conducting the Analysis of Need for each school and the district. These might include profiles developed through a North Central/AdvancED Accreditation or Rule 10 Continuous Improvement accreditation process, Improvement Plans included in the NCLB Consolidated application, schoolwide plans, or other improvement processes or plans.

The district must design and implement intervention activities consistent with the final requirements of the models for all Tier I and Tier II schools. ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant funds can only be used to implement one of four intervention models in any Tier I or Tier II school. Each intervention model has specific requirements that must be implemented. In Section 2, Descriptive

Information School Level, Action Plans, and Budget forms have been designed to ensure that all the requirements of the model selected are addressed for Tier I and Tier II schools. Action Plans and Budget forms have also been designed for Tier III schools. Section 2 of this application must be completed for each school.

Madison High School is in year 1 of Title I School Improvement Status. In the 2012-13 school year, NeSA results showed that 78% of the Eleventh Grade Students had reached proficiency in Reading and 63% had reached proficiency in Math. These results allowed Madison High School to achieve an AYP status of Met in both Reading and Math for the 2012-13 school year. However, under other academic indicators, the district's four-year graduation rate went from 82% in 2011 to 79% in 2012. This has placed Madison High School in the Needs Improvement category and on the School Improvement List. Madison Public Schools will need to reach the Met status on AYP for two years to move off this list.

Because of this status, Madison will develop and implement a three-year plan to help move our graduation rate toward the statewide goal of 100%. A planning committee was developed to submit a plan to the Nebraska Department of Education. This committee was made up of stakeholders from the District and used current data to drive decision making. The three-year plan will incorporate researched-based methods to connect with parents and students on academic achievement, and communicate the importance of graduation rates.

- B.1 Describe the district's contribution to assist schools in their analysis of need and selection of an intervention model. The District must demonstrate that it has analyzed the needs of each school, such as instructional programs, school leadership and infrastructure, and selected interventions for each school aligned to the needs of each identified school. A district may request funds for LEA-level support of the efforts of their schools in implementing one of the intervention models. Requests for these funds must be included in a LEA-level budget (Part C) and are considered part of the limitations on funding (\$50,000 to \$2,000,000 per school per year). The description should clearly indicate how district contributions and support are separate and distinct from the school's efforts and activities.

The Madison Public School District has provided and will continue to provide support as Madison High School implements the required and permissible activities detailed in this school improvement grant application. The Superintendent and High School Principal provided a report to the Board of Education regarding the available intervention models. The Board of Education and Administrative Team both feel the transformation intervention model is the only available model to implement.

The district will continue to provide regular staff development funding and programs for our staff that will be supplemented by the professional development activities that are included in this grant application. The district would like to apply for \$150,000 for the 2014-15 school year, \$125,000 for the 2015-16 school year, and \$100,000 for the 2016-17 school year, for a total of \$375,000 for the three-year period.

Madison High School will provide support to the staff and students by employing a .25 FTE Intervention Project Manager (IPM) to coordinate the High School SIG process in the High

School. This person will coordinate efforts with all stakeholders to help bring a team approach to support Madison High Schools.

In addition, the district would use grant funds to pay for 25% of a high school alternative education instructor. This would help foster the school-to-home relationships that best practice has shown is necessary for at risk students to achieve.

The High School grant would also be used to fund 25% of a Reading and Math coach position to help reinforce our district's School Improvement goals in the areas of Reading and Math. The district would also use funds to pay for 25% of a Community Counselor.

The High School grant we are applying for would allow the district to support multiple positions in achieving the goal of improvement of district graduation rates. This type of support will not happen without the grant funds. In year two, the support of each position would move to 20%, and during year three to 15% to allow for smooth budget transition as we move away from the grant.

Also as part of our Tier 3 application, the grant funds would support professional development for all high school staff in the areas of behavior management (BIST) and academic reinforcement. The transition from our Middle School TeamMates program into the High School would also be part of the grant.

- B.2 Describe factors that indicate the district has the capacity to use the school improvement funds to support each Tier I and Tier II school identified for intervention. Such factors must include: sufficient human and fiscal resources, past history of successful reform initiatives, credentials of staff, ability to recruit and employ a new principal and new teachers, support of parents, community and the teachers union. Indicate how the District will ensure that each Tier I and Tier II school that it commits to serve receives all of the State and local funds it would receive in the absence of the School Improvement Grant funds and that those resources are aligned with the interventions.**

History of School Improvement Success:

The Madison School District has shown improvement in all buildings over the last past three years. We have had a Reading Coach working with our teachers and paraprofessionals to help them improve their implementation of the Reading Mastery reading program. As a mentor, the person in this position has provided valuable leadership to help our teachers and paraprofessionals demonstrate early and continued success with the new series. During the past two years, we have reassigned a portion of a Middle School math teacher's instructional time so that he can serve as our new Math Coach. He quickly established himself as a mentor and resource provider in implementing this new research-based mathematics series. These changes, along with new programs in student management and professional development in reading, math, and technology, provide past evidence of the steps the district has taken to improve.

The District's teacher and administrative evaluation process was also aligned to student achievement goals, and the use of the Danielson model has been used to allow for accountability for all staff. This has had a positive impact on the conversations between building administrators and staff.

These programs, along with the commitment of District staff, allowed both the Elementary and Middle Schools to move off the School Improvement list in the 2012-13 school year. This, along with the District's move to District-wide NCA accreditation in the 2013-14 school year, should allow the District to reach a common focus to serve the needs of our community.

Additional Improvements Efforts:

Reading Mastery Program: This program has been used successfully for kids in Kindergarten through eighth grade, and has allowed students to be placed at appropriate reading skill levels. All staff was provided training in Direct Instruction methods. Additional staff development on the Reading Mastery program provides ongoing support for staff.

Saxon Math Program: The Saxon Math Program has been used at Madison Public Schools during the last three years. The scope and sequence of the program allows for Saxon Math to be taught in Grades K-12. Professional Development has been provided on a yearly basis from the Math coach to allow the program to provide positive student data. During the 2012-13 school years, steps were developed to combine 8th grade Math with our Algebra I curriculum. This allowed us to offer class content earlier which created two tracks for math beginning in 8th grade:

1. (8) Algebra I, (9) Geometry, (10) Algebra II, (11) Trigonometry/Pre-Calculus, (12) Calculus 1
2. (8) Algebra IA, (9) Algebra IB, (10) Geometry, (11) Algebra II or Standards Math, (12) Math Topics or Algebra II or Trigonometry

RTI Implementation: The RTI team has come together during the 2013-14 school year to review data to help drive decisions made on student performance. This has allowed an open communication on ways to best meet the needs of our District. The RTI Team has started to take shape at the Elementary, with plans to move into the Middle and High School.

Behavior Intervention Support Team (BIST program): Madison Public School's staff members have been trained in using the BIST model that supports a caring community and a productive academic environment. BIST empowers schools to change lives and behavior skills by focusing on three components: Balance of grace and accountability, Powerful language to problem solve, and Consistency in expectations.

Title I Programs: Madison Public Schools offers School Wide Title Programs for students, and also serves Targeted Assistant Private Schools. The Title Program helps support current programs and helps students build skills in both Math and Reading.

Preschool Programs: Both 3 and 4 year old preschool programs have been established to allow additional support for families, and to help build academic and social skills before students enter Kindergarten. These programs serve over thirty students to help Madison improve.

Strategies for further Improvement:

Advance Education Process: In March of 2014, Madison Public Schools will host an AdvancED Education external team visit to review the past five years of data and to develop a plan to support our ever changing school makeup. The feedback from this visit will allow us to align our District Mission to current curriculum, and make data based decisions to further drive student performance.

School Improvement Team: During the 2013-14 school year, the District has created a School Improvement Team that meets monthly to look at student achievement data. It has also helped look at professional development needs of the district. This group works to align best practice with current teaching methods and blend the learning opportunities.

Curriculum Purchase Schedule: The administrative team has developed a Schedule for updating textbooks in the District that includes a budget plan to support the District to stay current. This, along with realigning the curriculum, is helping teaching staff to develop classroom objectives that closely align to classroom lessons.

High School Alternate Education Program: At this time the District is planning to develop a 9-12 Alternate Education Program to work with students that are at risk of not meeting graduation requirements. The Instructor will have multiple endorsements to help teach onsite core classes. This, along with Apex online offerings, will allow students to have additional opportunities to meet the four-year graduation requirement in AYP.

RTI Implementation in grades 6-12: The plan is to form an RTI Team that meets on a monthly basis to help provide a positive impact on the Graduation Rate at the High School. This Team will design plans to meet the needs of individual students that have attendance issues and struggle to meet graduation requirements.

District Reading and Math Coach: The District plans to invest funds in a full time position that works with classroom teachers on a daily basis to improve teaching performance in the areas of Math and Reading. These subjects seem to be especially difficult for our Migrant and ELL students. This person will also work with students that are identified as at Risk.

Teacher and principal Evaluation: As the District moves forward, the additional growth and reinforcement of best practice in the classroom will need to continue to improve in the area of proper goal setting and attainment of the goals.

Teammates Program: The district would look to expand this program to meet the needs of High School students that are at risk of not graduating.

Credentials of Staff

Teacher Name	Subject Area	Years of Experience	Degree
Jim Crilly	MS/HS Principal	3	MA
Trish Braithwait	Technology	7	MA
Dana Brandl	Math	28	MA +27
Julie Engleman	ELL	12	BA +27
Robert Fite	Social Science	8	BA +9
Dan Fuhs	Social Science	4	MA
Suzy Goedeken	Science	15	MA +18
Connie Herz	Title I	16	BA +9
Steve Jirsa	Music	15	MA
Sue Jurgens	FCS	18	BA +27
Patrick Kratochvil	Science	17	MA +11
Paul Leathers	Industrial Tech	13	BA+27
Darin Lovercheck	SPED	8	BA
Peggy Shepard	English	4	BA
Ryan Sorensen	PE	6	BA
Mike Sunderman	Business	35	BA +36
Riley Swedburg	Math	4	BA

Teresa Wagner	English	9	BA +18
Casey Wolta	Art	9	BA +6

Professional development has included a number of efforts in the past few years. The District has implemented the Whole Faculty Study Group professional learning community model. All teachers are involved in a small study group that is focused on making improvements in either reading or math. All staff have also been provided in-depth training in Robert Marzano's Classroom Instruction That Works educational strategies. As a follow-up to that, a number of staff were provided training in Classroom Instruction That Works for English Language Learners in August, 2010. Elementary, Middle, and High School math teachers received training in implementing the Saxon Math instructional resources during the summer of 2010. In addition to these activities, the District has encouraged staff to participate in other forms of professional development as provided by the Educational Service Unit, Nebraska Department of Education, and subject area professional organizations.

During the 2012-13 school year, staff members were provided multiple Professional Development activities to help build technology skills among the staff members. Apple Professional Development was contracted to help support our 1-1 move to ipads in the Middle School and to enhance technology use in the High School. Staff and students are aligned with the District's 1-1 laptop program. The start of the 2013-14 school year brought opportunities for training for our ELL program. This was provided by Cindy West of Lincoln Public Schools who now serves as an ELL consultant.

Ability to recruit new teachers

Strategies to attract Highly Qualified Staff

Mentoring program for new staff members

Excellent facilities and 1 to 1 technology environment

Competitive Salary and benefit package

Madison is a diverse community of approximately 2,400 people located in Madison County. Madison is proud to be the home of the Madison County Fair and Rodeo, and also hosts annual 4th of July and Christmas in Madison celebrations.

The community offers a library, museum, parks, golf course, swimming pool, and an active business district to meet the needs of families. Multiple church denominations also serve the community.

Madison and its friendly folks are located within an hour drive to several lakes for summer fun and recreation. The area is well known for hunting and fishing opportunities and is a great place to settle down and raise a family. Madison is full of Progress, Pride & Possibilities.

Madison Public Schools offer a comprehensive educational curriculum for grades P-K through 12, and offers special programs and activities geared to provide enrichment, exploration, and instructional support for all students. Our District has highly qualified, nurturing, and dedicated staff that goes above and beyond in providing quality academic programs.

Along with our teaching staff, parents, businesses, and community members are committed and dedicated to providing strong educational opportunities for all of our children. The School District offers excellent 21st century learning opportunities to prepare our students for the global world.

- B.3 If the district is not applying to serve each Tier I school in the district, provide an explanation as to why it lacks the capacity to do so. Lack of capacity must address the same factors listed above: sufficient human and fiscal resources, past history of successful reform initiatives, credentials of staff, ability to recruit and employ a new principal and new teachers, support of parents, community and the teachers union. A district with both Tier I and Tier III schools may not elect to serve only Tier III schools.**

Madison Public Schools had received Tier I grants for Madison Elementary in 2010-11, and a Tier I grant in 2011-12 for our Middle School Building. At this time, both grants are in place until the end of the 2013-14 school year, and have allowed our District to show improvement. The Madison Elementary has moved off the Improvement list at this time. The resources from the previous grants have allowed the District to fund the programs needed to meet the needs of our students.

At this time Madison High school is designated as a Tier III school due to our graduation rate falling below required guidelines. We are not eligible to apply for additional grants for our Elementary and Middle schools at this time. For additional questions about prior grants, please refer to those documents that were submitted.

- B.4 ESEA Section 1003(g) funds are intended to turn around a low-performing school. Major changes required in such a turnaround may require external assistance from a person(s) or a company(s). External assistance might be desirable to assist with specific activities to meet the requirements of the intervention model selected. If a district elects to have an external provider, the district must identify the provider(s) by name or company; the reasons or rationale for selecting this provider; the specific services to be provided; the qualifications, including expertise and experience of the provider; and the procurement method used for securing and selecting the provider(s). Note: The Intervention Project Manager is not considered an external provider since he/she must be an employee of or on contract with the district and work full or part-time in the school.**

External assistance in improvements areas could come from the following areas:

Advanced External Team Members:

Dr. Kristin Sherwood, Wichita, Kansas
Dave Gibbons - Schuyler Community Schools
Jamie Garner - ESU #15, Trenton, Nebraska
Shavonn Holman - Lincoln, Nebraska
Dr. Geri Fitzgerald – Laramie, Wyoming

Madison Public Schools and Madison High School will continue to utilize external assistance from multiple sources to assist teachers and improve student learning. Meralee Hoffelt of Exemplar, Inc. will continue to provide high quality consultation and professional development in reading and math instruction. Educational Service Unit #8 (ESU8) staff providing ongoing professional development and support are Stephanie Wanek(reading), Heidi Rethmeier (math), Deb Wragge (professional development and teacher mentoring), and Corey Dahl (technology integration). Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) staff will work with Madison Elementary on a consultative basis. NDE staff includes Brad Conner & Randy McIntyre (Title 1 Needs Improvement).

- B.5** Since each Tier I or Tier II school receiving ESEA Section 1003(g) funds will be a schoolwide project, all programs and services provided in the school should be aligned to the selected intervention model. The school level Analysis of Need section of this application should involve staff from the various programs and services in the school. Describe the steps the district will take to ensure that other programs and resources are aligned to support the school in implementing an intervention model. Identify the specific programs and sources of funds.

Question if needed

- B.6** If the selected intervention model includes increasing school time, changing governance at the school level, etc., the district may need to modify existing practices or policies to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively. Describe the steps the district will take, if necessary, to modify policies and practices. Some changes may require approval of the local union

Over the last three years, Madison Public Schools added additional time to the schedule and is currently looking into increasing school time to meet the ever-changing needs of our students. Summer school has been offered along with summer feeding programs. The summer programs have been in place for students in grades PK-8, and with the new Accountability funds, additional time would be provided through a summer school alternative education program. Over the past four years, Madison Public Schools has shown the flexibility to make changes in the schedule to help improve student performance. The additional focus on the RTI process at the High School will also align all programs to better serve the students.

- B.7** Describe the steps the district is prepared to take to sustain the intervention model(s) in the selected school(s) after the ESEA Section 1003(g) funds are no longer available. The response might include how the district will institutionalize changes made to meet requirements, adopt changes throughout other schools, or support the school or school(s) throughout the process to fully implement the selected intervention model(s).

Madison Public Schools has shown evidence of using past grants funds to increase student achievement. This process has been trial and error with the District becoming a bit dependent on grants funds with two of our three schools currently using grant funds.

The plan for the High School grant would be to only help fund a portion of several positions, so that as the three years pass by the District could gradually bring expenses back to the general fund. We are looking to fund 25% of an IPM position, 25% of a Reading and Math Coach, 25% of a community Counselor position, and 25% of a alternative education teacher.

We have found that using data to evaluate the current programs allows for appropriate interventions. This data will also be shared with all stakeholders and reviewed on a monthly basis. The District feels that the additional time with our highly qualified staff will increase our students' opportunities to learn. This process will have a positive impact on our AYP and NeSA results in the future.

- B.8 The District must describe its consultation, as appropriate, with relevant stakeholders regarding the District's application and implementation of the school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools. The district must establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both Reading and Mathematics and the leading indicators in order to monitor schools that receive these school improvement funds. The chart below provides the minimum goal for each student achievement and leading indicator. The district may decide to accept these minimum goals or set higher goals. If Tier III schools are included in this application, the district will be held accountable for setting rigorous goals or adopting these goals if using the variation of the Transformation model. If the district goal will be the same as the State goal, complete the district column with "Same".

Area	State Goal	District Goal
Reading	The gains for "all students" group and for each subgroup must meet or exceed the statewide average gain (unless the statewide average is zero then the gain must be at least zero). Progress is MET if a majority of the groups demonstrate an increase.	Same
Math	The gains for "all students" group and for each subgroup must meet or exceed the statewide average gain (unless the statewide average is zero then the gain must be at least zero). Progress is MET if a majority of the groups demonstrate an increase.	Same

Leading Indicators

Leading Indicator	State Goals	District Goals
AYP Status (includes both Reading and Math)	Fewer NOT MET AYP decisions	Same
Graduation rate (high schools only)	Measurable increase from the previous year	Same
College enrollment rate (high schools only)	Measurable increase from the previous year	Same
English proficiency	Increase in percentage of English Language Learners that reach Levels 4 or 5 on ELDA (if applicable)	Same
Leading Indicators (includes dropout rate, student attendance, number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (high school only), discipline incidents, truancy)	Measureable improvement from previous year (or baseline for initial year of grant)	Same
Teacher attendance and teacher performance	Measurable improvement from previous year (or baseline data for initial year of grant)	Same

Statewide Average Change (2012-13 AYP Data)				
Group	Reading		Math	
	Percentage	District	Percentage	District
All Students	2.50	2.55	1.69	1.74
American Indian / Alaska Native	3.81	3.85	2.79	2.79
Asian	1.47	1.52	0.69	0.74
Black or African American	3.77	3.82	0.96	1.01
English Language Learners	3.66	4.01	0.54	0.59
Hispanic	4.26	4.31	2.20	2.25
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	7.43	7.45	-2.11	-2.12
Special Education Students	2.22	2.27	0.14	0.15

Students Eligible for Free and Reduced	3.15	3.20	1.62	1.65
Two or More Races	3.14	3.20	2.13	2.15
White	2.16	2.21	1.85	1.90

- B.9 Describe the process used by the district to assist its schools in developing this application. Include the district level staff, by position, that were involved in developing this application and who will be involved in supporting the implementation of the intervention models.

A team was created to develop this application. The team responsible for developing the application consisted of Alan Ehlers, Superintendent; Ruffin Stirling, IPM Coordinator; Jim Crilly, Principal; Secondary Certificated Staff members; ESU #8 Professional Development Team; and Mike Sunderman, Secondary Teacher. The implementation of the project will involve all secondary teachers.

- B.10 Pre-implementation activities/costs are allowable for this grant. Districts must identify the amount and provide a description of the use of any funds awarded under this application for Year 1 activities that are proposed to be spent between approval by the State Board (April) and July 1. See page 79 of the guidance at:
http://www.education.ne.gov/federalprograms/Title_1_Part_A_SIG.html

A budget line for "Pre-Implementation Activities" is included on the budget pages.

Pre-Implementation activities will be evaluated based on: (a) relevance to the plan as a whole, (b) whether the activities are reasonable and necessary and directly related to the requirements of the selected model, (c) address the identified needs from the Analysis of Need, (d) have promise for improving student academic achievement, and (e) meet the "supplement not supplant" requirement.

Allowable activities for pre-implementation costs include:

- Family and Community Engagement: holding parent and community meetings to review school performance, discuss intervention models and develop school improvement plans;
- Rigorous review of external providers;
- Staffing: recruiting and hiring a new principal and new teachers;
- Instructional Programs: providing remediation and enrichment sessions during the summer of 2013 in schools that will adopt an intervention model at the start of the 2013-14 school year;
- Professional development and support: providing professional development to help staff implement new or revised instructional programs aligned with the school's plan and SIG intervention model; and
- Preparation for Accountability measure: developing and piloting a data system for use in SIG funded schools, analyzing data, developing and adopting interim assessments, etc.

The District is planning to use Title Funds to move into the pre-implementation phase of the Secondary Alternate Education program during the summer of 2014. The Identified student will be required to attend summer classes on a weekly basis to provide evidence of progress in our Apex learning program. The Teacher of the Alternative Education Program will be contacting Parents on a weekly basis, and be in charge of developing family involvement nights during the year. The Alternative school will also develop a Parent Advisory group that

meets to discuss progress and strategies to measure growth in student achievement and graduation rates.

Additional pre-implementation funds may be requested to help provide additional training for Secondary staff members in the BIST program. This program allows the staff to function as a common team to provide students with a safe environment in the school.

PART C. LEA-LEVEL BUDGET

A LEA-level budget is needed *only* if the district is requesting funds for LEA-level support for the school(s) to assist in implementing one of the models as identified in question B.1. above. LEA-level costs are allowable but cannot cause the entire application to exceed the established funding limitations (\$50,000 to \$2,000,000) per school and must clearly be LEA-level activities and necessary to assist the school(s) to implement one of the models.

- C.1 Describe the proposed activities, including the pre-implementation activities, and how the activities will assist the school(s) to implement, fully and effectively, one of the intervention models within the time period of this grant. See B.10 above for requirements, allowable uses, and evaluation of pre-implementation costs included in LEA-level budgets.
- C.2. The District may choose to complete the optional LEA-level Budget for District-level support among all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools receiving a School Improvement Grant. If a District is submitting an application for only one building, costs for LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention model in a Tier I, Tier II or Tier III school *may* be included in the budget for the building. The link to the Budget Form is: <http://www.education.ne.gov/federalprograms/Documents/Title%20I/Title%20IG%20School%20Improvement/SIG%20Budget%20MASTER%201.16.2013.xlsx> The EXCEL Spreadsheet contains all budget pages, for all three years, including a summary budget for the entire application. Appendix C contains a sample budget page for the LEA.

NOTE: When budgeting for the three-year period, NDE would expect to see the budgets decrease each year. Keep this in mind when planning for sustainability after the grant period comes to an end.

PART D. ASSURANCES

By submitting this application, the District assures it will do the following (Double-click the box and select "Checked."):

- ☐ (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the district commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- ☒ (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the NDE) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;

- ☒ (3) Ensure that each Tier I, Tier II and Tier III school that it commits to serve receives all of the State and local funds it would receive in the absence of school improvement grant funds and that those resources are aligned with the interventions;
- ☐ (4) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements;
- ☒ (5) Monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken, as outlined in the approved SIG applications, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality;
- ☒ (6) Monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to schools on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding; and
- ☒ (6) Report to the NDE the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

PART E. WAIVERS

Check each waiver that the district will implement. (Double-click the box and select "Checked.")

- ☐ "Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- ☐ Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

Section 2. SCHOOL LEVEL INFORMATION

Complete a Section 2 for each school included in the application.

PART A. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION SCHOOL LEVEL

Each school must conduct and complete the Analysis of Need (A.1.). That information should be used to select an intervention model. Action Plans (A.2.) and Budget forms are designed for each intervention model. Applicants should duplicate forms as needed and delete unnecessary forms before submitting.

School Level Information for Tier III Schools

- Tier III schools that are Title I schools in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring have the option to use these funds to support, expand, continue or complete the schools Needs Improvement plan. These schools must complete the Action Plan (A.3.).
- Tier III schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds can only apply to use these funds for a variation of the Transformation intervention model. The school must meet all of the requirements EXCEPT requirements A1 and C1. The Action Plans note this option for these Tier III schools.

The intervention models are designed to turnaround a school and the requirements are numerous and specific. A school making a commitment to take on the major changes involved must have a person devoted solely to managing and coordinating the process. In addition to the requirements of each intervention model, Nebraska is requiring each school receiving ESEA Section 1003(g) funds to have a full-or part-time Intervention Project Manager (IPM). The IPM will have, at a minimum, a current Nebraska teaching certificate. The position will be at the school level. The Intervention Project Manager (IPM) must be experienced and qualified to lead the effort and must be an employee of the district or on contract to the district. The responsibilities of this person include: working with the school principal and district administrators to assist with coordinating implementation activities, conducting ongoing evaluations of progress, ensuring appropriate collection and management of data for reporting progress on the goals established for student achievement and leading indicators, and coordinating and reporting progress to the NDE. The costs of the Intervention Project Manager are to be included on the budgets for each school.

Prior to completing the school Level Information, it is important to read the Guidance provided by the U. S. Department of Education. The guidance for ESEA Section 1003(g) grants provides the information needed for understanding the requirements, the four intervention models and is on NDE's Title I-A school improvement homepage at:

http://www.education.ne.gov/federalprograms/Title_1_Part_A_SIG.html

A.1. Analysis of Need

Information gained from a thorough analysis of need is used to identify the most appropriate intervention model and activities for each requirement. The analysis of need includes (a) Student Achievement and Leading Indicators; (b) Services/Programs Profile; (c) Staff Profile; (d) Curriculum/Instructional Practices Profile; (e) System Profile; and (f) a description of the stakeholders involved and the process used. Schools are encouraged to use information on identified needs from

other sources like data retreats, school improvement processes, schoolwide project plans, and Improvement Plans included in the NCLB Consolidated application, if available.

Student Achievement and Leading Indicators

This analysis must include information on the following student achievement and leading indicators for each school included in the application. Annual reporting is required of each district receiving an ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant on both. The data submitted in this application will be the baseline data for measuring progress in each of the three years of the grant.

Complete the table below using 2012-13 data. Provide an explanation if any data is not available.

Reporting Metrics for the School Improvement Grants	
Student Achievement not captured on the Profile from the State of the Schools Report	
(1) Percentage of limited English proficient students (of all ELL students that were tested) who attained a Level 4 or 5 on the ELDA	0%
(2) Graduation rate (AYP graduation rate for high schools only)	88.47%
(3) College enrollment rate (high schools only)	50%
Leading Indicators	
(4) Number of minutes within the school year	76,824
(5) Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework, early-college high schools or dual enrollment classes (high schools only)	18%
(6) Dropout rate (total for high schools only)	5%
(7) Student attendance rate	96.75
(8) Discipline incidents (suspensions, expulsions as reported to NDE)	0%
(9) Truants (although this is a required Metric, districts do not need to report baseline data at this time)	
(10) Distribution of teachers by performance level on district's teacher evaluation system	
(11) Teacher attendance rate (although this is a required Metric, districts do not need to report baseline data at this time)	

- (a) Student Achievement and Leading Indicators - List identified areas of need. Compare the identified areas of need to the intervention models and the required activities for each model. How will the intervention model selected help the school to meet the needs identified from the Student Achievement and Leading Indicators Profile? Provide an explanation for any missing data (excluding numbers 9 – 11).

The analysis of need has identified the primary area of need as the improvement of Graduation rates. This area is linked to the school improvement goals in math and reading. The intervention, and the additional focus on staff, students, and parents, will allow all stakeholders to move toward meeting the state goals regarding graduation rates. These actions will assist the school in improving student learning in math and reading. In addition, the intervention model will provide opportunities to develop a behavior plan to positively affect those issues. Under new leadership, planning for Response to Intervention-Behavior will take place during the 2014-15 school year with an implementation date of Fall 2015.

- (b) **Programs/Services Profile** – This profile identifies programs/services that support academic achievement for struggling students and might include summer school, tutoring programs, before and after school services; parent and family engagement; community partners, social workers, etc. List identified areas of need. Compare the identified areas of need to the intervention models and the required activities for each model. How will the intervention model selected help the school to meet the needs identified from the Programs/Services profile?

Programs such as summer school will be put in place in grades 9-12 during the summer of 2014 and paid for using Title I funds. One goal of adding the additional summer school session will allow the teacher to work with families to develop a plan that will lead to credit recovery and graduation. This will lead directly into an alternative school program that will allow the school to target those struggling students and provide additional instruction and intervention at the correct level of difficulty.

- (c) **Staff Profile** – An analysis of need might include a profile of teachers in the school (years of experience, education attained, etc.); professional development provided; teacher evaluation system; etc. List identified areas of need. Compare the identified areas of need to the intervention models and the required activities for each model. How will the intervention model selected help the school to meet the needs identified from the Staff Profile?

The Madison Public Schools submits this application on behalf of Madison High School with these indicators of capacity to successfully address the goal of dramatically improved student achievement:

- **Our classroom teachers also demonstrate the initiative and capability for meeting the goals of this improvement effort. Currently, there are 18 full-time certificated staff members at Madison High School, in addition to some shared staff that work in the Elementary or Middle school. Among the 18 full-time certificated staff members, six have Masters Degrees in their subject areas. Others are positioned on the salary schedule such that they could easily move into that level of educational preparation. All the teachers are endorsed, with only one being outside their assigned instructional duties. There is a nice mixture of years of educational experience as well. Nine teachers are in their first 10 years of teaching, and nine teachers are in years 11 through 35 years of teaching experience. We believe this provides a good balance of instructional background for our students to experience. These 18 teachers have a total of 228 years of experience!**

Professional development has included a number of efforts in the past few years. The District has implemented the Whole Faculty Study Group professional learning community model. All teachers are involved in small study groups that are focused on making improvements in either reading or math. All staff have also been provided in-depth training in Robert Marzano's Classroom Instruction That Works educational strategies. As a follow-up to that, a number of staff were provided training in Classroom Instruction That Works for English Language Learners in August, 2010. Elementary, Middle, and High School math teachers received training in implementing the Saxon Math instructional resources during the summer of 2010. In addition to these activities, the District has encouraged staff to participate in

other forms of professional development as provided by the Educational Service Unit, Nebraska Department of Education, and subject area professional organizations.

During the 2012-13 school year, staff members were provided multiple Professional Development activities to help build technology skills among the staff members. Apple Professional Development was contracted to help support our 1-1 move to ipads in the Middle School and to enhance technology use in the High School. Staff and students are aligned with the District's 1-1 laptop program. The start of the 2013-14 school year brought opportunities for training for our ELL program. This was provided by Cindy West of Lincoln Public Schools who now serves as an ELL consultant.

Implementing the actions in this grant application will further enhance those improvements in student performance and allow for our graduation rate to increase. Recent trend data shows that students have fallen short in the areas of math and reading in order to meet the district graduation rates, and additional support is needed.

- (d) Curriculum/Instructional Practices Profile – An analysis of instructional practices might include alignment of curriculum to content standards; vertical alignment of instructional approaches; use of formative and summative assessment data to inform instruction; differentiated curriculum, etc. List identified areas of need. Compare the identified areas of need to the intervention models and the required activities for each model. How will the intervention model selected help the school to meet the needs identified in the Instructional Practices Profile?

Madison High School is planning to use additional research-based strategies and practices to change instructional practice to address the low graduation rates that caused the school to be identified as a Tier III building.

Math: The K-12 math curriculum has been aligned with the Nebraska State Math Standards. That curriculum guided selection of a K-11 research-based core program, Saxon Math, that was implemented during the 2010-11 school year.

Reading: The Nebraska State Language Arts Standards were adopted. The Reading Mastery Signature Edition and Corrective Reading programs were implemented in grades K-8 in 2009, and continue to be used as the core program. This allows students to come into the Madison High School with the skills to track into the research-based Language Arts classes.

Student progress in math and reading will be monitored by using the results of NeSA-Reading and NeSA-Math. Additional assessment results (standardized, local program data) will be used to monitor and evaluate effectiveness as well. Appropriate interventions will be implemented to assure the growth of all students in both math and reading. This data, along with year-end graduation rates from NSSRS tracking of students, will allow the District to better monitor the graduation rate over the four years as required in AYP accountability.

The tier III grant model and associated funding through this school improvement grant will enable us to implement all of the required actions and some permissive actions which will lead to significantly increased levels of student performance.

- (e) System Profile – Indicators of system support might include alignment of school improvement efforts and plans (NCA, Rule 10, Accountability Grants, Schoolwide Plans, etc.); extending the length of instructional time, school day, etc.; governance flexibility at the school level; etc. List identified areas of need. Compare the identified areas of need to the intervention models and the required activities for each model. How will the intervention model selected help the school to meet the needs identified in the System Profile?

The action plan contained in this school improvement grant application aligns well with ongoing school improvement efforts under the NCA AdvancED process. Current school improvement goals are in place for math and reading. Madison Middle School currently has an Accountability grant focused on improving student performance in both math and reading. Madison High School operates as a school wide Title I building with goals in math and reading.

Increasing the length of the instructional day from Monday through Thursday is being considered at this time to allow more time to help struggling students improve in the areas of math and reading.

The transformation intervention model and associated funding through this school improvement grant will enable us to implement all of the required actions, and some permissive actions, which will lead to significantly increased levels of student graduation rates.

- (f) Describe the process used, the participants involved, and the involvement of stakeholders in analyzing the needs of this school and selecting the intervention model.

The Accountability Compact Team (administrators, teachers, parents, and ESU 8 staff) met to review data, problem solve, brainstorm ideas, and develop a plan to increase student achievement in the areas of math and reading. NDE and ESU representatives provided technical assistance in the areas of research on universal screeners and core programs. The group worked together to develop a plan that will increase student achievement in math and reading for all students. Current members of the ACT team are:

Superintendent:	Alan Ehlers
MS/HS principal:	Jim Crilly
Elem. Principal:	Kenny Loosvelt
Title I Teacher:	Kay Wehrle
IPM:	Ruffin Stirling
RTI/ESU:	Cathy Fiala

A.2. Action Plans

When the analysis of need is completed, the school must select one of the four intervention models, based on the identified needs, and develop plans to implement the model, fully and effectively, within the three years of this grant. It is critical to read and understand the requirements of each model before making this decision. The guidance from the U. S. Department of Education provides information, explanations, and the definitions of the four models provided below.

Four School Intervention Models (from USDE Guidance)

(a) Turnaround model:

(1) *A turnaround model is one in which a district must--*

- (i) *Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates;*
- (ii) *Using locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students,*
 - (A) *Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and*
 - (B) *Select new staff;*
- (iii) *Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school;*
- (iv) *Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;*
- (v) *Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability;*
- (vi) *Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;*
- (vii) *Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students;*
- (viii) *Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and*
- (ix) *Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.*

(2) *A turnaround model may also implement other strategies such as--*

- (i) *Any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation model; or*
- (ii) *A new school model (e.g., themed, dual language academy).*

(b) Restart model: *A restart model is one in which a district converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. (A CMO*

is a non-profit organization that operates or manages charter schools by centralizing or sharing certain functions and resources among schools. An EMO is a for-profit or non-profit organization that provides "whole-school operation" services to an LEA.) A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

(c) School closure: School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

(d) Transformation model: A transformation model is one in which an LEA implements each of the following strategies:

(1) Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

(A) Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model;

(B) Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that--

(1) Take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor as well as other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduations rates; and

(2) Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement;

(C) Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so;

(D) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (e.g., regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies; and

(E) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school.

(ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement other strategies to develop teachers' and school leaders' effectiveness, such as--

(A) Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school;

(B) Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development; or

(C) Ensuring that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher's seniority.

(2) Comprehensive instructional reform strategies.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

- (A) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards; and
 - (B) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.
- (ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies, such as--
- (A) Conducting periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;
 - (B) Implementing a schoolwide "response-to-intervention" model;
 - (C) Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content;
 - (D) Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program; and
 - (E) In secondary schools--
 - (1) Increasing rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement; International Baccalaureate; or science, technology, engineering, and mathematics courses, especially those that incorporate rigorous and relevant project-, inquiry-, or design-based contextual learning opportunities), early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers, including by providing appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework;
 - (2) Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;
 - (3) Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit-recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; or
 - (4) Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or graduate.
- (3) Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools.
- (i) Required activities. The LEA must--
 - (A) Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and
 - (B) Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.
 - (ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement other strategies that extend learning time and create community-oriented schools, such as--
 - (A) Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs;
 - (B) Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff;

- (C) *Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment; or*
- (D) *Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.*

(4) Providing operational flexibility and sustained support.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

- (A) Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; and*
- (B) Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).*

(ii) Permissible activities. The LEA may also implement other strategies for providing operational flexibility and intensive support, such as--

- (A) Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA; or*
- (B) Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.*

Completing the Action Plans

Since all requirements of the intervention model selected must be implemented, Action Plans have been designed to ensure that each requirement is addressed. Each requirement in the intervention model selected for this school has an Action Plan. Add tables for permissible activities if implementing more than one for each requirement. Delete the Action Plans for the other intervention models.

Activity – Not all requirements will need a “new” activity. If the school has already started implementing an activity within the last two years, that meets the intervention requirement, it should be described. Instead of new Start and Implementation dates, it should be noted that it is or was already being implemented. Existing activities may or may not have costs from this School Improvement Grant. See question G-1 of the U. S. Department of Education Guidance.

The Key Steps must identify the short- and long-term steps needed to implement the intervention model. Major “Activities” should have sufficient detail in the Key Steps to allow a reviewer to determine whether the school has given serious consideration to the pieces that need to be accomplished in order to implement the intervention.

Action Plans are to cover the three-year period that the School Improvement Grant is available. Optional Pre-Implementation activities should be included in the Action Plans, if applicable, and would be included in the Year-1 budget. The Action Plans contain a Start Date and an Implementation Date. The Start Date should identify when the school will begin the activity. The Implementation Date is the expected date when the intervention will be operational. NOTE: The three year availability of these funds, contingent upon an annual review and approval for continued funding, means that activities can span the entire three years. However, it is expected that schools will begin meeting the requirements as soon as possible. The Action Plans must indicate that the school will be able to implement the intervention model in the first year and to fully implement the model within the three years of funding.

In addition to asking schools to identify, by position, the person(s) responsible for each activity, the Action Plans ask for a description of how the school will monitor progress and evaluate the process of implementation. Each school is required to have an Intervention Project Manager who would, most likely, be the person to monitor and report progress on implementation activities.

Each Action Plan contains a field for an estimated cost over the three years. This was included to ensure that costs are being considered as plans are being developed. The estimated cost over the three years will not be cross-matched to the final figures on the budget pages. It is intended to help schools identify costs by requirement since the budget forms require costs to be separated and identified by each requirement of the intervention model selected.

NOTE: When budgeting for the three-year period, NDE would expect to see the budgets decrease each year. Keep this in mind when planning for sustainability after the grant period comes to an end.

A.3. Action Plans for Tier III Schools

A Tier III school that is a Title I school in school improvement, corrective action or restructuring has an option to use the ESEA Section 1003(g) funds to support, expand, continue or complete the plan approved for the school's Title I Accountability Funds under Section 1003(a). If using this option, an Action Plan must be completed for each activity that the school is requesting funds.

The activities must be described with sufficient specificity for reviewers to see the connection to identified needs and the potential to produce outcomes that meet the purpose of these funds – to increase achievement and assist schools to exit the AYP improvement status.

Pre-Implementation Action Plan – Tier III	
Activity	Implement alternative education summer program grades 9-12
Key steps	Identify Students that are at future risk of not graduating, develop timeline for summer classes, assign staff member to teach the program, meet with parents to explain student options, develop curriculum.
Start Date	May, 2014
Full implementation date	July 1, 2014
Person(s) responsible	Superintendent, MS/HS principal, Intervention Project Manager, Instructional coach, and Alternative Education teacher
Monitor and evaluate	Superintendent
Cost for three years	\$4,205 Paid with Title I funds
Tier III – Improvement Activities Action Plan 1	
Activity	Assign IPM to 25% High School manager and have them compile data and to help guide the improvement process. The project manager will also work with the Administrative team and the Alternative Education teacher to identify students and prepare individualized learning plans for each student.
Key steps	The project manager will use data to assist the alternative education teacher to better meet students needs.
Start Date	July, 2014
Full implementation date	July 1, 2014
Person(s) responsible	Project Manager
Monitor and evaluate	Superintendent
Cost for three years	\$60,000
Tier III – Improvement Activities Action Plan 2	
Activity	Hire Alternative Education teacher to be paid 25% by grant and 75% with District funds.
Key steps	Advertise and hire person with multiple endorsements and ability to reach at risk students. Could be same person that teaches summer school in the Pre-implementation phase.
Start Date	July, 2014
Full implementation date	July, 2014

Person(s) responsible	Superintendent, Project Manager, MS/HS principal
Monitor and evaluate	Superintendent
Cost for three years	\$60,000
Tier III – Improvement Activities Action Plan 3	
Activity	Hire Reading and Math coach to be paid 25% by grant and 75% with District funds.
Key steps	Advertise and hire person with experience in Saxon Math curriculum and Language arts background that aligns with needs of the local and state testing requirements.
Start Date	August, 2014
Full implementation date	August 25, 2014
Person(s) responsible	Superintendent, Project Manager, MS/HS principal
Monitor and evaluate	Superintendent
Cost for three years	\$60,000
Tier III – Improvement Activities Action Plan 4	
Activity	Hire community counselor to be paid 25% by grant and 75% with District funds.
Key steps	Identify the correct person who connects with families and encourage them to keep students in school instead of going to work at the plant before finishing school. This person would also work with parents on attendance issues.
Start Date	August, 2014
Full implementation date	August 25, 2014
Person(s) responsible	Superintendent, Project Manager, MS/HS principal
Monitor and evaluate	Superintendent
Cost for three years	\$60,000
Tier III – Improvement Activities Action Plan 5	
Activity	Continue to implement a schoolwide BIST behavior program and provide additional training and support for High School staff.
Key steps	Provide additional monthly support from the BIST consultants for teachers in grades 9-12. Offer additional Professional Development in-service opportunities.
Start Date	August, 2014
Full implementation date	August 25, 2014
Person(s) responsible	Superintendent, Project Manager, MS/HS principal
Monitor and evaluate	Superintendent, Project Manager, MS/HS principal
Cost for three years	\$30,000
Tier III – Improvement Activities Action Plan 6	
Activity	Provide Exemplar Consultant reviews to observe, model teach, and

	conference with staff regarding implementation of Reading and Math programs.
Key steps	Identify number of days needed to support the Math and Reading Coach and the classroom teachers.
Start Date	September, 2014
Full implementation date	September 2, 2014
Person(s) responsible	Superintendent, Project Manager, MS/HS principal
Monitor and evaluate	Superintendent, Project Manager, MS/HS principal
Cost for three years	\$30,000
Tier III – Improvement Activities Action Plan 7	
Activity	Support the transition of the TeamMates mentoring program as it moves into the High School. Pay salaries related to High School time for coordinators.
Key steps	Provide additional training and support for the coordinators to expand the program by identification of additional community members to match with High School students. Organize additional TeamMates nights to promote the program expansion into the High School.
Start Date	June, 2014
Full implementation date	June 1, 2014
Person(s) responsible	Project Manager, MS/HS principal and TeamMates Coordinators
Monitor and evaluate	Superintendent
Cost for three years	\$15,000
Tier III – Improvement Activities Action Plan 8	
Activity	Provide professional development that aligns with school improvement goals and core curriculum instructional programs that align with graduation requirements in the District.
Key steps	All High School teachers will receive training on teaching trends that tie to best practice at the High School level. All teachers will be involved in monthly meetings that develop plans for students that are at risk of not graduating, and will monitor the progress of each student.
Start Date	August, 2014
Full implementation date	August 25, 2014
Person(s) responsible	Project Manager, MS/HS principal
Monitor and evaluate	Superintendent
Cost for three years	\$12,000

PART B. BUDGETS

Budget forms have been designed to assist Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools in budgeting, by intervention model, for each of the three years of funds availability. Total amounts for each object code are calculated for each year and also transferred automatically to the three year Summary Budget and District Summary Budget form.

NOTE: When budgeting for the three-year period, NDE would expect to see the budgets decrease each year. Keep this in mind when planning for sustainability after the grant period comes to an end.

Budget forms are found in a separate EXCEL file at:

<http://www.education.ne.gov/federalprograms/Documents/Title%20I/Title%20IG%20School%20Improvement/SIG%20Budget%20MASTER%201.16.2013.xlsx>

Appendices (Included as a Separate Documents)

- **Appendix A: NDE Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools (PLAS) Selection Process**
- **Appendix B: Reviewers Rating Rubric and Checklist**
- **Appendix C: Budget Pages**

TIER III SCHOOL BUDGET FOR YEAR 1 (2014-15)							
NDE County District No.:	59-001						
District Name:	Madison Public Schools						
NDE School No.:							
School Name:							
Activity	100	200	300	400	500	600	Total for Listed Activity
List below activities that will be used for Tier III school reform.	Salaries	Employee Benefits	Purchased Service / Lease Agreement	Supplies & Materials / Computer Software	Computer Hardware / Equipment	Travel Professional Development	
(1) Intervention Project Manager	20,000	5,000		6,000		5,000	\$36,000
(2) Reading and Math Coach	20,000	5,000		1,000		2,000	\$28,000
(3) Alternative Education Teacher	20,000	5,000		5,000		2,000	\$32,000
(4) Community Counselor	20,000	5,000		1,000			\$28,000
(5) TeamMates Coordinator	5,000			1,000			\$6,000
(6) Contracted Services			20,000				\$20,000
Totals by Object Code	\$85,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$14,000	\$0	\$11,000	\$150,000

[illegible]

[illegible]

DO NOT ENTER INFORMATION IN THE BUDGET BELOW. IT IS DESIGNED TO TOTAL THE BUDGET FROM ALL 3 YEARS.

TIER III SCHOOL COMBINED BUDGET FOR YEARS 1, 2, & 3 (2014-17)

NDE County District No.:	59-001								
District Name:	Madison Public Schools								
NDE School No.:	0								
School Name:	0								
Activity	100	200	300	400	500	600			
Activities listed below will be used for Tier III school reform.	Salaries	Employee Benefits	Purchased Service / Lease Agreement	Supplies & Materials / Computer Software	Computer Hardware / Equipment	Travel Professional Development	Total for Listed Activity		
(1) Intervention Project Manager	45,000	15,000	0	10,000	0	9,000	\$79,000		
(2) Reading and Math Coach	45,000	15,000	0	3,000	0	6,000	\$69,000		
(3) Alternative Education Teacher	45,000	15,000	0	9,000	0	6,000	\$75,000		
(4) Community Counselor	45,000	15,000	0	3,000	0	6,000	\$69,000		
(5) TeamMates Coordinator	15,000	5,000	0	3,000	0	0	\$23,000		
(6) Contracted Services	0	0	60,000	0	0	0	\$60,000		
Totals by Object Code	\$195,000	\$65,000	\$60,000	\$28,000	\$0	\$27,000	\$375,000		